

**Minutes of the
Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC)**

Meeting on July 21, 2003

Continental Plaza Auditorium

601 North 7th Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Stella Aguinaga Bialous, Bruce Allen, Lourdes Baézconde-Garbanati, Theresa Boschert, Gregory Franklin, Susan Hildebrand-Zanki, Kirk Kleinschmidt, Cheryl Raney, Dorothy Rice, and Deborah Sanchez

MEMBERS ABSENT :

Ron Arias, Alan Henderson, and Rod Lew

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Gregory Austin, WestEd

Dileep G. Bal, Chief, Cancer Control Branch, Department of Health Services (DHS)

Kimberly Bankston-Lee, California Black Health Network

Roxanna Bautista, Asian Pacific Islander Tobacco Education Network (APITEN)

Kelli Bliss, Local Program Unit (LPU), Tobacco Control Section (TCS), DHS

Julie Bradley-Hart, The Center for Tobacco Policy and Organizing

Shelly Brantley, American Lung Association (ALA)

Wade Brynson, California Department of Education (CDE)

Ralph Cantor, Alameda County Office of Education (COE)

Sheri Cobra, San Joaquin COE

David Cowling, Assistant Chief, Data Analysis and Evaluation Unit (DAEU), TCS, DHS

Dennis Eckhart, Attorney General's (AG's) Office

Marian Gage, Butte COE

Larry Gruder, Tobacco Related Disease Research Program (TRDRP), University of California (UC)

Nancy Guenther, Local Program Unit (LPU), TCS, DHS

Cynthia Hannah, Media Campaign Unit (MCU), TCS, DHS

Jennifer Ibrahim, UC San Francisco

Kathony Jerauld, DAEU, TCS, DHS

Cindy Jones, Sacramento COE

Rae Kine, Safe and Healthy Kids Program Office (SHKPO), CDE

Diane Kiser, ALA, Bar and Restaurant Employees Against Tobacco Hazards (BREATH)

Paul Knepprath, ALA of California

John Lagomarsino, SHKPO, CDE

Roberta Lawson, LPU, TCS, DHS

Jon Lloyd, Chief, DAEU, TCS, DHS

Cindy Macklin, SHKPO, CDE

Ken McCarthney, SHKPO, CDE

Jamie Morgan, American Heart Association (AHA)

Sharen Muraoka, American Cancer Society (ACS)

Tony Najera, Consultant, DHS Director's Office

Greg Oliva, Chief, Program Planning and Policy Development, TCS, DHS
Cathy Palmer, Chief, Administrative and Contract Support Unit, TCS, DHS
Terry Pechacek, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
April Roeseler, Chief, Local Programs and Evaluation, TCS, DHS
Luanne Rohrbach, University of Southern California
Meredith Rolfe, Chief, SHKPO, CDE
Bill Ruppert, TCS, DHS
Raul Salazar, American Indian Tobacco Education Network (AITEN)
Claradina Toya, AITEN
Traci Verardo, Next Generation California Tobacco Control Alliance
Dan Walsh, Food and Drug Branch, DHS
Gregory Wolfe, SHKPO, CDE
Amy Wong, APITEN

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING COMMENTS

The Chairperson, Kirk Kleinschmidt, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. Each of the Committee members introduced themselves. Members of the audience also introduced themselves and identified their affiliations. The Chairperson expressed concern that the Committee members were still not receiving the agenda and minutes in a timely manner, and he asked DHS staff to provide these to members much earlier prior to meetings. The Chairperson thanked staff who had gathered and provided materials to the Committee as homework for this meeting regarding the school-based tobacco use prevention agenda item.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, REVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The minutes for the May 19, 2003, TEROC meeting were approved as written. The Chairperson pointed out some of the correspondence in the meeting packet. There were no comments or questions.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENTS

The Chairperson and members announced that:

- The new Federal Trade Commission data for 2001 show the tobacco industry (TI) spent \$11.22 billion promoting their products (an increase of 17 percent from the prior year), with \$1.36 billion for California. They are outspending California tobacco control and prevention by increasingly larger margins.
- TI lawsuit against California is still active as AG's Office will explain later in the meeting. Litigation is a major harassment strategy of the TI.
- The class action lawsuit in Illinois against the TI was sent back to the lower court.
- Philip Morris is suing a number of stores, mostly in the central valley, over selling fake Marlboro cigarettes.
- UC San Francisco has circulated a new report on campaign financing in California showing that the TI spent approximately \$7 million in the last campaign cycle.
- The Governor signed an executive order on June 10, 2003, ordering the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, when conducting alcohol law enforcement activities, to monitor stores for compliance with state tobacco laws. The Chairperson commended the Governor on his vigilance regarding youth access to tobacco.

- The Board of Equalization (BOE) has changed its formula for taxing other-tobacco-products, causing a reduction in the tax on other-tobacco-products, at a time when the finances of the state are in terrible shape. This causes one to wonder what is behind BOE's action.
- The tobacco tax in New Jersey is now \$2.05 per pack, the highest in the nation. This is double California's tax, which is 19th in the nation.
- The legislative bill to license tobacco retailers, Assembly Bill 71, still has major problems. AHA, ACS, and ALA are all opposed to the bill unless it is amended to include provisions to adequately deal with under age sales of tobacco.

4. TOBACCO LITIGATION IN CALIFORNIA

Dennis Eckhart from the state AG's Office provided an update on tobacco related litigation in which his office is involved.

Mr. Eckhart stated that there was a court hearing June 11, 2003, regarding the lawsuit filed April 1, 2003, against Diana M. Bontá, R.N., Dr.P.H., DHS, Director, and Dileep G. Bal, M.D., DHS, Chief, Cancer Control Branch. The plaintiffs, R. J. Reynolds (RJR) and Lorillard tobacco companies, charge that DHS is vilifying the TI, violating their first amendment rights, prejudicing juries, and preventing them from getting a fair trial anywhere in the state. The plaintiffs have also petitioned for a preliminary injunction to prevent certain ads from being used in the state. Additionally, ACS, AHA, and ALA filed a joint amicus curiae (friend of the court) brief in support of the state defendants' opposition to the tobacco companies' motion for a preliminary injunction halting the ads. The plaintiffs had to show that they were direct Proposition (Prop) 99 taxpayers, so they added RJR smoke shops as plaintiffs. Two attorneys from the AG's Office have worked full time on this matter for three months. The state had filed a motion to dismiss the case questioning the TI's right to sue and the merits of the case. The most important issue for the court is determining whether the case involved free speech or government speech (truthful government speech is protected from lawsuits). At the June 11, 2003, hearing the court concentrated on the basis for the TI claim, and there is no ruling yet. The AG's Office expects an early decision. There are no personal implications or monetary consequences for Dr. Bontá and Dr. Bal. The American Legacy Foundation lawsuit, which is still in discovery, has different issues (compliance with the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement [MSA]) and will not affect this case.

Regarding other tobacco litigation, the trial and appellate courts have ruled in favor of the state in its lawsuit against RJR tobacco company for violating the MSA provision strictly limiting the length of time outdoor cigarette ads may remain up in conjunction with sponsored racing events. The TI had waived its first amendment right in the MSA. There is another state suit over free coupon and free sample distribution on public property that is an important case testing state regulatory authority. There are also state suits pending against six Internet retailers.

5. NATIONAL EVALUATIONS OF TOBACCO USE AND PREVENTION EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Terry Pechacek, Ph.D., from the federal Office on Smoking and Health (OSH), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), provided a handout (see enclosed) and presented on national studies of school-based tobacco use prevention programs and recommendations from CDC's Guide for Community Prevention Services.

Dr. Pechacek explained the extensive process for evidence reviews used by OSH: use of experts; identification of a conceptual framework; the identification of and review of citations, papers, and studies; rating the quality of evidence; and translating the strength of evidence into recommendations for use. Of the 17 studies analyzed regarding school-based tobacco use interventions, 9 had a community media campaign, 3 had a media series, and 11 had a community education program. The task force of experts regarded eight studies as the strongest because they contained media and community education components along with in-school interventions, and because these showed the greatest absolute percent change or improvement in the intervention groups in comparison to the control groups. The primary conclusion of the evidence reviews showed that the use of school-based interventions are or can be effective when combined or coordinated with mass media campaigns and community education activities. Also, school-based interventions are more effective when they are delivered by students and include student activities.

Dr. Pechacek affirmed that CDC and OSH have always said the school component is part of a comprehensive tobacco control program, and stressed that the community education component is the glue of the program. He said there is little evidence to support a state relying on a single intervention or single component of the program to achieve reduction in tobacco use and its effects. He said an exception would be policy activities such as excise taxes, smoking bans, and so forth. He pointed out evidence that stand-alone school programs that change students' attitudes regarding tobacco do not reduce or delay initiation nor result in fewer tobacco users. He said the "how to" of the interface of community health and school health is continually under discussion at CDC.

In response to questions (Is California on the right path? How about community interventions without the school component?), Dr. Pechacek responded that prioritization or disaggregation of components has been raised since the early 90s and there is no answer. He added that results have shown California is doing something right. Florida is regarded as a good model without a school component, but the community education component did some interventions in the schools. He said that an OSH task force is continuing to study the school-based component, and emphasized that evidence is clear that school-based tobacco use prevention programs, as well as minors' access activities, should not be implemented unless they are an integral part of a community and mass media program. He concluded that, as budgets get tighter, states should go more towards a policy focus and away from a service program focus.

6. EVALUATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DHS staff explained that there were no handouts at the meeting because the most recent data presented had not yet been approved for release. However, a hard copy of TCS slides presented at the meeting are enclosed with these minutes, excluding the unreleased data.

Staff described: the mandate for the evaluation of the school-based Tobacco Use Prevention and Education program (TUPE); the Independent Evaluation (IE) for the years 1996-00; the new school-based TUPE evaluation based on data collected during the 2001-02 school year; the purpose and scope of the evaluation; the collaboration with CDE; the research designs; the standards and methodology used; the findings; and, the conclusions and implications of the findings.

Presenters explained that from 1989 through 1994, CDE was responsible for both administering and evaluating the TUPE program. In July 1994, a legislative committee asked UC to evaluate

TUPE and, when UC declined, legislation was passed giving DHS responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the TUPE program as implemented in the public schools. DHS stated that it did not desire nor seek this responsibility but had no choice in the matter.

The purposes of the school-based evaluation are: summative, to assess effectiveness; and formative, to improve the interventions and the implementation of the interventions. The evaluation examines student, teacher, TUPE coordinator, and administrator survey responses in order to assess whether key aspects of district, school-site, and classroom TUPE program implementation are significantly associated with student tobacco use behaviors, exposure to second-hand smoke, tobacco beliefs and attitudes, and exposure to school, community, and media interventions. The overall study design contains tight quality controls over the administration of the evaluation, and the survey design ensures comparability with national data sources.

DHS has provided CDE opportunity to review and comment on the Request for Proposals for the TUPE evaluation, to participate in the proposal selection team, and to review and comment on the survey instruments. DHS and CDE collaborated on the sampling, school selection, and on outreach to the schools. CDE has participated in IE stakeholder meetings, and DHS gives CDE opportunity to review and comment on the evaluation reports. In addition, DHS staff outlined several collaborative projects with CDE in its community education program and media campaign. Notable barriers to collaboration between DHS and CDE are: different core missions, non-equivalent technical expertise between state staffs, differences in state-local autonomy, a tobacco only versus a multiple-risk approach, and focus on individual change versus community-wide change.

The IE, which consisted of three Waves (1996-97, 1997-98, and 1999-00 school years), was designed and conducted by a consortium of The Gallup Organization, Stanford University, and the University of Southern California. The consortium operated independently from DHS except for review of reports. The evaluation of TUPE was just one part of the IE. The IE consortium chose an analytic approach of assessing the correlation between exposure to the school program interventions and changes in outcomes between Waves one and three, plus (for high schools), outcomes in TUPE-grantee schools compared with outcomes in non-TUPE-grantee schools.

Some IE findings:

- From Wave One to Wave Three, the prevalence of 30-day cigarette smoking decreased significantly among 5th, 8th, and 10th graders statewide. There were parallel improvements in students' tobacco related knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs, as well as refusal skills. There was a similar trend nationally.
- These positive changes were not found to be significantly related to students' exposure to the TUPE program in elementary, middle, or high schools.
- There were no statistically significant differences observed in the tobacco use outcome indicators between TUPE-funded and non-TUPE-funded high schools.
- Among 5th graders, greater exposure to the program over the four-year period was associated with changes in one of the outcome indicators (beliefs about the negative health consequences of tobacco use).
- Among 8th graders, greater program exposure was not significantly associated with changes in any of the outcome indicators.
- In 2000, the majority of districts were not using tobacco use prevention curricula identified as "exemplary" or "promising" by CDC and the United States (U.S.), Department of Education.
- Approximately one-third of teachers who reported teaching at least one tobacco lesson did not address psychological factors related to tobacco, as recommended by CDC.

- In the 1998-99 school year, 81 percent of TUPE-grantee high schools and 41 percent of non-grantee high schools had an on-site cessation program for students. However, only 33 percent of student smokers were aware of the program regardless of TUPE-grantee status.

In the current DHS evaluation of TUPE (California Student Tobacco Survey [CSTS] 2000-02), the research questions are similar to Waves One to Three: assess prevalence of tobacco-related behavior, attitudes, and knowledge; assess types of school-based tobacco prevention and intervention policies and practices being implemented, and level, and consistency of implementation; and assess program exposure associated with lower levels of tobacco use and lower levels of factors known to be precursors of tobacco use. Exposure to other sources of tobacco control messages (community and media) is also assessed. Data collected is comparable to national data sources.

Some CSTS findings:

- From 2000 to 2002, the 30-day smoking prevalence for middle school students (6th-8th grades) significantly declined (from 6.7 percent to 4.4 percent), and likewise the 30-day smoking prevalence for high school students (9th-12th grades) significantly declined (from 21.6 percent to 16 percent). The high school smoking prevalence decline parallels a similar rate of decline for U.S. high school students.
- Of the teachers that taught TUPE in the last year, 45.6 percent report using non-published curricula; and 10.5 percent reported using one of the two CDC recommended programs.
- There is no statistical difference in grantee versus non-grantee teacher and school coordinator reports of using published curricula, hours taught, and various topics covered.
- TUPE-grantee schools are more than twice as likely as non-grantee schools to offer some type of cessation service.
- Students at grantee schools are more likely to have received information about tobacco at school, and to have been exposed to tobacco lessons.
- No differences were found in student tobacco use or precursors to tobacco use in grantee and non-grantee schools.
- Overall, students reported higher levels of knowledge when their teachers were well trained and when district and school administrators strongly supported TUPE.

DHS staff summarized its conclusions from both the IE and CSTS evaluations of TUPE:

- There is lack of consistent implementation of an evidenced-based approach from the state to school level.
- Where the program is implemented well (strong administrator support, infusion of tobacco use prevention curricula, and focused teacher training), there are measurable impacts.
- Student outcomes attributable to the TUPE program are minimal.

7. REFLECTIONS ON EVALUATING TUPE

Luanne Rohrbach, Ph.D., from the University of Southern California, explained that she had been in charge of the schools component portion of IE and, in the latter years of IE, she was the overall scientific lead. She passed out copies of her slides (see enclosed). Dr. Rohrbach pointed out some key findings and limitations of IE, and emphasized the importance of a comprehensive approach to a state tobacco control program. She referenced a Texas pilot study that demonstrated that greater reduction in youth tobacco use occurred in counties where there was an intensive media campaign and a comprehensive community and school program. (The Texas study cost \$10 per student.) She stated that the research design developed by the consortium for IE tried to link program exposure with outcomes, and she reflected that this might have been a

flawed design. She has since re-analyzed IE data and noted that few significant relationships were found between youths' self-reported program exposure and outcomes, but that she did find a significant association between teacher-reported implementation and student-reported outcomes.

Dr. Rohrbach concluded that:

- Stronger evidenced-based school tobacco program implementation will produce better outcomes, and these require adequate time and resources.
- A determination of program effectiveness should rely on more than one evaluation study or one data analytic approach.

Greg Austin, from the firm WestEd (which conducts the field research for DHS' current TUPE evaluation and does other work for CDE), stated that an archeology analogy is a good one for evaluation, that teacher training and administrative support are extremely important if the in-school program is to be effective, and more accountability is required. He said the challenge now is how are we going to get the necessary training to the teachers in these often complex programs and how are we going to get the necessary district support in an environment where schools are under siege to do nothing else but academic instruction.

8. CDE, SHKPO REPORT

CDE staff passed out copies of a CDE response to the letter sent by Carolyn Martin to TERO, and passed out a package of eight additional materials.

Wade Brynson, Assistant Superintendent, Learning Support and Partnership Division, CDE, said he wanted to make five points:

1. The IE evaluation of TUPE was based on data collected from 1996-00 and reflects the means of tobacco prevention during that time and not the present.
2. TERO should re-examine the responsibilities for conducting TUPE evaluation, and CDE recommends that another body (such as UC or TERO itself) be the contractor for the evaluation in the future.
3. CDE changes this year, such as the requirement that all grantees participate in the California Healthy Kids Survey, and the requirement that all districts implement TUPE programs based on scientific research, should contribute to enhancing the remarkable drop in prevalence of tobacco use by California students.
4. Before making any recommendations regarding TUPE, TERO should review the program effectiveness of all other Prop 99 programs.
5. CDE takes its responsibilities regarding the administration of the TUPE program seriously, and has worked over the years to improve the quality of the program and its accountability.

In addition, Dr. Brynson said CDE is interested in examining the possibility of having TCS and CDE put out a joint, competitive Request for Application in an effort to fund projects in which schools and their local communities would work together. He said the result could be compared with programs where schools and communities are not working collaboratively.

Staff continued the CDE report by stating that there were changes in CDE's administration of the TUPE program that were instituted subsequent to the last wave of IE. These changes require school-based programs to use the principles of effectiveness published in 1998 to provide

consistency across all programs, and to implement CDC guidelines. CDE outlined that, since 2000, there have been changes related to: providing technical assistance, conducting a needs assessment, establishing performance indicators, using effective research-proven programs, involving parents, analyzing survey data, conducting periodic evaluation, and making changes to programs based on results. Presenters explained that the following are in place: local accountability, tracking and monitoring, annual reports, coordinated compliance review, and a consolidated application, fiscal report, and local education agency plan. CDE staff pointed out data demonstrating the drop in youth tobacco use in recent years and said the schools are responsible for some of the positive tobacco related outcomes.

In response to a question regarding a base funding amount to primary schools, CDE staff explained that the TUPE workgroup recommended a base average daily attendance (ADA) allocation of \$3,000 to districts to provide greater resource availability to the smallest districts. The TUPE workgroup also recommended that the funds needed for this should come from the high school allocation. CDE added that TEROC had suggested that base funding come out of the ADA allocation rather than the high school grant allocation, and said CDE is prepared to do that.

CDE staff discussed concerns about the accuracy of Carolyn Martin's letter to TEROC based on the fact that it referenced old data, and that CDE has since implemented changes (described above).

9. TEROC MEMBERS DISCUSSION OF THE EVALUATION OF CDE PROP 99 PROGRAMS

The Chairperson opened the discussion for Committee members on the school-based tobacco education issue. The following is a compilation of statements made or questions raised:

- There is difference of opinion on what is the intent of the Carolyn Martin and Stan Glantz letters, whether to de-fund, to change the structure, or to improve the existing structure.
- The Martin and Glantz letters say Prop 99 money should be taken from the schools and be allocated to other components. However, it appears the Committee agrees the school funding should continue.
- It appears the experts say a comprehensive approach is needed, that some form of TUPE is needed, but how can this Committee ensure that it is or will be effective?
- At a previous meeting CDE conceded that Prop 99 did not intend or require a triad approach and today CDE says that it does.
- In the absence of data that shows school-based programs do or do not contribute to outcomes, there is not adequate information to de-fund the school component.
- The issue is more a matter of how to configure the in-school program, including whether to continue the entitlement portion.
- With the information given so far, a member was not convinced that money going to the schools is the best use of shrinking funds.
- The findings from the evaluation show that the TUPE program can work if there is strong district support and teacher education.
- CDE's programs have potential, but the implementation of TUPE by CDE seems to be the problem. The evaluation did a good job identifying the problems. But the question is whether the situation can be changed.
- Are the implementation problems widespread or narrow? A large amount of money is going to the schools, except it is spread thin. What is the best way to reduce implementation barriers?
- The challenge is how to maximize impact of the school-based program while the Health Education Account (HEA) continues to decrease. Is there a better way and is CDE capable?

- TEROC should look at how the money is targeted; more of the money should go to high schools; it would appear that grants provide more accountability than an ADA allocation.
- It appears that the Committee accepts the validity of DHS evaluation results.
- The evaluation results are not challenged, but there are some limitations.
- TEROC needs to address the issue of which entity should evaluate the TUPE program, and what design this Committee wants. Changing the entity would require legislation, and is any change warranted?
- When looking at any limitations of the previous evaluation design, we must be strategic about not cutting critical research questions when funding is limited.
- There may be some duplication in the evaluation, it is not clear.
- TEROC should look at HEA allocations. Schools seem to be protected from revenue decline cuts. A member was not convinced programs are as effective as they need to be, and stated limitations of data aside, it appears the CDE program is not effective.
- To change the allocations would probably not require legislation. Several years ago, TEROC played a major role in funding allocations.
- A member felt the Committee does not have enough evidence to change the allocation; at the same time, did not see enough evidence to support TUPE; however, was opposed to moving the schools evaluation to CDE.
- TEROC should focus on getting the Departments working together better.
- The Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) should be surveyed to see how collaboration is working with school districts.

Dr. Bal said he agreed that the science is not there. He said the thread of causality is tenuous; with multiple interventions, it is definitionally impossible to tease out causality. He said the issue is more of a political one than a scientific one. He described his belief that CDE needs more than 11 staff to do the job, and that CDE needs a much more aggressive approach.

The Chairperson stated that the matter cannot be resolved this day and suggested a Committee task force to pursue the questions. He discussed some possible issues to charge the task force with (evidence for or against a school-based program, the components and roles of a comprehensive program, purpose of the evaluation, research questions, what is known about the science). Dr. Pechacek inserted that DHS Evaluation Task Force (ETF) could help the Committee on some of these matters. He emphasized that these questions have relevance beyond California. Relative to the in-schools effectiveness discussion, he related that the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has funded Frank Chaloupa's group to look at more than 300 schools in depth, particularly at attribution for youth tobacco use rate decline. The Chairperson requested TEROC members to submit some questions for ETF to consider at its next meeting, and he requested that DHS report back from ETF.

CDE staff said that CDE agrees with the need to work with top-level district personnel to clearly and strongly emphasize recommended TUPE implementation, and that training is a major hurdle because the number of teacher training days is significantly reduced. A Committee member said TEROC could address some of the key evaluation findings at this time, since CDE has agreed that greater district support is needed and that better teacher training is needed.

The Chairperson concluded the discussion by saying that CDE and DHS should meet prior to the October TEROC meeting to discuss ways to address the implementation problems of the school-based programs as identified in DHS evaluations or by TEROC members. He asked that the questions below be addressed. The first three are the responsibility of CDE and the last item is the responsibility of both CDE and DHS.

1. How to obtain top-level school administrator support for TUPE.

2. How to improve teacher training.
3. What is the best method of allocating TUPE funds to middle schools (ADA allocation versus competitive grants).
4. How to increase local-level collaboration of schools and tobacco LLAs.

10. PROGRAM REPORTS BY AGENCIES

(Each agency sends a written report to TEROC prior to the meeting and responds to questions at the meeting.)

10a. UC, TRDRP Report

TRDRP staff announced that in June, TRDRP awarded \$18 million for 58 new research grants, the same number as in 2002, although for \$2.5 million less than in 2002. Additionally, TRDRP received \$4.4 million in one-time funds for fiscal year 2003-04 in the Governors' May-budget-revise. Following the recommendations of their Scientific Advisory Committee, TRDRP has identified five applications to be funded for approximately \$2 million of these one-time funds and will issue the Compendium of Awards later this summer. The strategic planning process has resulted in changes in TRDRP's priorities, and these are to be introduced in TRDRP's August newsletter. There will be information meetings for potential applicants in September and October. TRDRP is currently identifying candidates for the position of Director of TRDRP and hopes for a decision on the position in August or September. UC does not have a hiring freeze.

10b. CDE, SHKPO Report

CDE presented its report earlier in the meeting. See item 8b. on page 6.

10c. DHS, TCS Report

In response to a question, DHS staff stated the California Tobacco Survey report and the results of the CSTS are expected to be released in December 2003. Responding to a question on the media, staff said the anti-industry media ads are moving forward rapidly and they publicly thanked the Administration, and David Souleles in particular, for facilitating the approval process. Finally, responding to a question regarding the effect of the budget process, DHS staff said there is a hiring freeze, even transfers are frozen, and employees with less than 30 months of service have been notified that they were surplus employees – the first step of the layoff process.

11. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Marian Gage from the Butte COE told the Committee: 1) she is one of the original TUPE coordinators and there has been excellent cooperation and coordination in her county between LLA and the school districts over the years; 2) in rural areas you have to blend funding; 3) the local level supports the concept of a comprehensive program; 4) there is need for increased accountability but she asked why prevention is held to a higher standard; 5) prevention is threatened by the budget crisis, as it always is; and, 6) TEROC should be concerned with the fact that Prop 10, with its 50-cent tax on a pack of cigarettes, spends very little of their money on tobacco use prevention.

Claradina Toya and Raul Salazar from AITEN told the Committee: 1) they do not want TEROC putting pressure on the California Indian tribes to have a smoke-free environment in their workplaces (casinos); 2) they assert that each tribe must decide for itself and not be forced to do this; 3) they ask TEROC to be respectful of the sovereignty of each tribe; and, 4) AITEN is working on this in a cultural way, which takes longer, and asks to be allowed to do their work.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Gage for her comments and said the Committee is looking into the Prop 10 issue. He then thanked the representatives of AITEN and said the Committee will take their remarks under consideration.

NEXT MEETING DATES:

October 27, 2003, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Sacramento, Regular Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. DHS is to provide TEROC members a copy of their July 21, 2003, TEROC meeting presentation slides, excluding unreleased data.
2. TEROC members are to email questions they have for ETF to Kirk Kleinschmidt by August 8, 2003.
3. DHS to provide a summary of the ETF meeting at the October 27, 2003, TEROC meeting.
4. CDE and DHS to meet before the October TEROC meeting to discuss ways to address the implementation problems of the school-based programs as identified in DHS evaluations or by TEROC members. The first three bullets are the responsibility of CDE and the last bullet is the responsibility of both CDE and DHS.
 - How to obtain top-level school administrator support for TUPE.
 - How to improve teacher TUPE training.
 - What is the best method of allocating TUPE funds to middle schools. (ADA allocation versus competitive grants.)
 - How to increase local level collaboration of schools and tobacco LLAs.

ENCLOSURES

1. Copy of Dr. Pechacek's presentation slides.
2. Copy of the DHS evaluation presentation slides.
3. Copy of Dr. Rohrbach's presentation slides.

KJ/BR: mp

G:\Tcs\TEROC\Mtg. Minutes\2003\TEROC Mtg Minutes 7-21-03 edited.doc